

Clare Golden

April 1952

CHILD WELFARE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

VOLUME XXXI • NUMBER 4

price 35 cents

HV
741
A21
C.18
V.31
no. 4
C.2

7 to
ll be
stive
from
eces-
s up
onal-
ope-
these
RD
School
V. Y.

nally
Sal-
ions.
ervi-
Cath-
dren,

three
medi-
and
ncy.
work
vice
tion
and
per-
000,
mily
odge

por-
year
peri-
fare.
ddi-
tely
tate
eno,

ol of
sec-
ncy
ion,
uid-
aly-
ter.
Ex-
nnel
Mrs.
hire
H.

18]

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• EDITH L. LAUER, Acting Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N.Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Residence Unit for Adolescent Boys and Girls	3
A Day Care Program To Meet Community Needs	7
Editorial Comments	
Howard W. Hopkirk Takes New Appointment	10
Book Notes	17
Classified Ad Service	18

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, *Board Member, Children's Aid Association, Boston, Mass.*

Policy Committee

MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS
E. MARGUERITE GANE

MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER
MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK

GRACE A. REEDER
SOPHIE VAN S. THEIS

Advisory Committee

SALLIE E. BRIGHT *Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.*
MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE *Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*
HYMAN GROSSBARD *Clinical Director, Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School, Hawthorne, N. Y.*
DR. ROMAN L. HAREMSKI *Supt., Child Welfare Division, State Department of Public Welfare, Springfield, Ill.*
DOROTHY HUTCHINSON *Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.*
ADELAIDE KAISER *Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.*
FRIEDA M. KUHLMANN *Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Society, Newark, N. J.*
MARY LOIS PYLES *Consultant, U.S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.*
VERNE WEED *Assistant Executive Director, Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.*
RUTH WEISENBARGER *Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, New York, N. Y.*
HELEN M. WHEELER *Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass.*

A RESIDENCE UNIT FOR ADOLESCENT BOYS AND GIRLS*

Claire Stone

Director, Social Service Department
The Leake and Watts Children's Home
Yonkers, N. Y.

This article describes a program now past the experimental stages and proving successful in the care and treatment of adolescent boys and girls.

WHEN DePeyster Cottage at Leake and Watts came into being, we hadn't planned it at all as an experimental unit. That it became such, and that it has attracted so much attention because of our "courage", "daring" or "foolhardiness" in putting together so many unconventional and even "unsound and unhealthy" ideas in one cottage unit, still amazes us. DePeyster came into being through a rather complicated chain of events, and out of our own desperate need for more beds. At this point, after nearly two years, what "just happened" seems sound and good and we can look back and attempt to analyze what we have done.

Leake and Watts started out as a large congregate institution for "helpless orphan children". Its original charter, written in 1831, specified that there be no discrimination because of race, creed or color. Over the years, however, by virtue of the state social welfare law and the fact that separate agencies served Negro and white children, Leake and Watts was accepted as a white Protestant children's home. It was not until 1942 that, stimulated by New York City's "Race Discrimination Amendment", the institution embarked on an interracial program.† By this time, too, many other changes had taken place. The "Home" was well on the way to becoming an effective community child-care agency rather than an isolated "Orphan Home". By February, 1950, when DePeyster opened, the interracial program was firmly established, both staff and children happily and profitably integrated. Other things had happened too—the institution was no longer a congregate, but a cottage type; the number of children in care had been deliberately reduced from over 500 in the late 1920's to about 125. A foster home department had been established in 1944 and had grown by this time to nearly 200 children. The public school unit on the grounds had been closed and all the youngsters were attending schools in the community. A community recreation program was under way. All this was done with a twofold purpose—to integrate our children in

the community, and to make the community aware that our children were basically no different than others.

Casework Program Integrated

Over the years, too, a sound and effective casework service had developed and the whole institutional program had gradually become psychiatrically oriented. At the time DePeyster Cottage opened, the staff included a consultant psychiatrist, a clinical psychologist skilled in therapy, and eight full-time caseworkers who worked directly with children in the institution as well as in the foster home department, and also worked closely with the house staff group. DePeyster, too, from its very beginning has been closely identified with the casework and clinical program.

The particular events which led directly to the physical creation of DePeyster occurred in October and November, 1948—two fires, set by one of our very disturbed youngsters, which wrecked a good part of our antique congregate building and precipitated major structural changes. We had for a long time talked of a "temporary care unit" where children might be placed at intake, giving us a better opportunity to work with them to determine the best possible permanent placement. In the plans for remodeling the building after the fires, what is now DePeyster was visualized as this temporary care unit. As such, it had to be designed for both boys and girls, and with small sleeping units, as conceivably there would be a wider age span among prospective occupants.

It took sheer architectural genius to create a modern, attractive cottage unit from a wing of the main building. This wing had housed food and clothing storerooms, a huge sewing room, an ancient playroom, and much waste space. It is now the most modern living unit on our grounds, complete with its own attractive living room and dining room, a large "rumpus room", a kitchen and bathrooms that are the envy of everyone else at "Leaky", an apartment for the cottage parents, and, best of all, bedrooms for the children. The second floor is arranged with the cottage parents' apartment in the center, girls' quarters on one side and boys' on the other. There

* Presented at the New York State Conference of Social Work, Buffalo, November, 1951.

† See "Negro Children at the Leake and Watts School", by Richard Paul, Director, and Claire Stone, Director of Social Service, Child Welfare League of America Bulletin, June, 1946.

are three single bedrooms, three double rooms, and two larger rooms which can accommodate four and six children respectively. These last are set up, however, for three and four youngsters each, with the extra space available in case of some emergency need.

The decision to use our new "temporary care" unit "temporarily" as a permanent care cottage came about from sheer necessity. Following the fires, it had been necessary to crowd existing cottages and also to suspend institution intake because considerable dormitory space had been lost. We had had to postpone admission of some children who had been accepted for care and who, for various reasons, could not be referred elsewhere. During the eighteen months between the second fire and the opening of DePeyster, some of the overcrowding had been alleviated by the normal movement of children to foster homes, own homes, jobs, etc.—but we were still jammed in spots and desperately needed the additional bed space.

Cottage Parents Key to Success of Plan

Before discussing the selection of children for DePeyster, I should like to describe the cottage parents, for without them this story could not be told at all. They are a Negro couple with two grown daughters. Elton Fax is a free-lance artist. We had known the family for about six years; for a good part of that time Mr. Fax had taught art groups at Leake and Watts. Both the girls had been counsellors at our camps for several summers, and during the summer of 1949 both Mr. and Mrs. Fax had been on the camp staff. During the past few winters, hardly a weekend had passed without anywhere from one to ten of our youngsters spending the day with the Faxes in their Brooklyn home. Their approach to children is direct, realistic and honest, with a real awareness of the integrity and individuality of each child. Our children, practically without exception, had a great deal of respect and affection for them. In the fall of 1949, when we still expected DePeyster to be a temporary care unit, we proposed to them that they join the staff as cottage parents, and to our delight, after careful consideration, they agreed, on condition that Mr. Fax be free to continue his free-lance drawing. They stayed with us through the change in plans for the unit, and have remained on our staff. I should add here that they had had no previous institution experience other than that mentioned, which is very different from being twenty-four-hour cottage parents. They are well-educated, intelligent, creative people with some knowledge of the dynamics of behavior, a wealth of common sense and a real desire to help children develop their own potentialities to the

utmost. I might also add here that there had been no carefully worked out plan to staff DePeyster with a Negro couple—that the Faxes are Negro was incidental to the fact that they have the qualities we want in our cottage parents. We've been told we were pioneering to have Negro cottage parents—we think we just had good sense to ask them, and are fortunate that they chose to accept.

And how did we choose the children for this group? I'm afraid that again we had no carefully worked out plan. We had felt for some time that boys and girls could live in the same cottage, given the proper physical setup and, more important, the proper cottage parents. Here we had both, so there was no question but that the cottage would be coeducational. The next problem was to decide, in an institution which had no small bedrooms for children but rather dormitories housing anywhere from six to fifteen, who should have the three single rooms. I might add here that there was much clamor from the children themselves to go into DePeyster when they knew the Faxes were to be parents there, which in a way complicated our decisions. That year we had five girls in the senior high school graduating class, all fairly adequate youngsters—one Negro, one Chinese, and three white girls. We thought they might enjoy the smaller living quarters, partly as a senior privilege, and partly as a step toward leaving group living. The girls, when the proposal was made, accepted eagerly. The three single rooms and one double room went to them.

Seriously Disturbed Children Chosen

In each of the other cottage groups there were children who were not doing well, some whose problems were accentuated by their particular group, who seemed to need more space or more privacy; some who seemed completely unable to get along despite all our efforts. The result was that the eleven other beds in DePeyster were filled by eleven seriously disturbed children who had failed dismally in at least one, and sometimes in a number of placements, either with us or with other agencies prior to coming to us. The decision to try placement in DePeyster was made in terms of each child's particular needs, together with our hopes that the combination of a more nearly ideal physical setup and the Faxes' own personalities and philosophies of child care might work some miracle. There could not have been a more heterogeneous group—sixteen boys and girls, ages ten to eighteen, Negro, white, Oriental—and with all the children's behavior problems in the books.

When we finally had the children assigned and moved in, we sat down to reflect—and then began to

get frightened at what we had done. Selecting the children in terms of their particular needs, and the Faxes' ability to accept and work with them individually, was one thing—but to have so many complicated youngsters with so many aggressive behavior problems all together under one roof with brand-new cottage parents was something else entirely. We began to wonder what would happen if the children all ganged up on the cottage parents—after all, they had known the Faxes before, but not in the disciplinary role—how could we predict what would happen on either side? However, as the weeks went by, nothing spectacular happened, and gradually everyone relaxed and could watch with some objectivity what was happening in DePeyster.

Almost immediately the group began to "jell" and to take on some semblance of organization. The Faxes were eager to create a feeling of true family unity in the group, and to develop a spirit of pride and cooperation among the youngsters. The children, without exception, were delighted with the attractive newness of their home. The routine chores, usually one of the friction points in group living, were presented as necessary to keep the cottage clean, cheerful and attractive. Job assignments were rotated at short enough intervals so that no child got bored or felt too "put upon"; everyone had a turn at every job. The kitchen crew might be made up of a high school girl, the youngest boy, and a couple of in-betweens. The cottage parents, instead of "supervising", worked right along with the children, and in no time the work was done. Children who had balked at routine jobs in other groups began not only to show some sense of responsibility about their performance, but a real sense of personal accomplishment and pleasure. The practical problems of job organization were worked out with the children's participation, harmoniously and without undue incident. Extra jobs were handled on a volunteer basis, although there was no reward other than the satisfaction of achievement. I remember one Saturday afternoon stopping in at the cottage and coming upon Mr. Fax and three of our most aggressively hostile boys having a hilarious time waxing the "rumpus room" floor. Somebody had said it would look better waxed and it was obviously a privilege to the boys to take over. Incidentally, they had a wonderfully constructive outlet for their aggression; these same youngsters, before, had delighted in destructive behavior and had frequently been in difficulties because of this.

Problems Kept "Within the Family"

Not only in the matter of routine chores, but in all matters of cottage life and daily living, the policy of

mutually discussing and deciding problems and plans was followed. There was no punishment for misbehavior or error, but rather an attempt, through example, to stimulate group feeling and awareness of acceptable behavior. The Faxes were determined, insofar as possible, to work with difficulties within the cottage, drawing in the administrative and case-work staff for suggestions when needed, but handling the particular situation themselves directly with the child. This in itself had great meaning for the children, many of whom had previously spent many hours in the director's office. The youngsters felt that their misdeeds were no longer known to everyone, but rather that they were "within the family". They also were able to see with greater clarity the effect of their behavior on the comfort and well-being of the rest of the cottage family. For instance, when someone stole money from Jane, who had carelessly left it around, Jane told the cottage parents, who asked that she say nothing more about it. They replaced the money, because it was Jane's school carfare, and pointed out her carelessness in leaving it around. Mr. Fax then spoke privately with Rose, who had a long pattern of stealing, because he was pretty sure she was the offender. He said that he was sorry the money had been taken, as it had been school money, which Rose probably hadn't realized. He had repaid it, and hoped there would be no recurrence. Rose was overwhelmed by this approach, admitted her guilt, and offered to repay the money, which she had already spent, from her allowance. Mr. Fax matter-of-factly dismissed the incident by telling Rose that no one else need know of it; Rose was amazed that she was not punished—and in nearly two years, has not stolen in the cottage. There have been other incidents, at school and in the community; one of these, which was reported to the director by the school, was quietly referred back to Mr. Fax, who handled it much as before, pointing out, however, that the consequence of such behavior might well be more drastic outside. It is too much to hope that Rose will not slip again, but we are certain that the more positive approach will do more to prevent further difficulties than a negative, punitive approach. What has happened is that Rose is becoming increasingly aware of the implications of her behavior, and from an almost psychopathic denial of problems, is reaching the point where it may be possible to offer direct psychotherapy.

The stealing was not Rose's only problem. She was enuretic, aggressive, belligerent, demanding, denying the need for placement because of her need to cling to a cruelly rejecting mother who simply did not want her. She was a chronic runaway, both from her own home and from previous placements. She

could not use casework or psychiatric help at first—anyone who indicated a wish to help her was “prying”—and she would have no part of it. She had first to find someone she could both respect and trust—and then slowly she could even allow herself to like an adult and be liked in return. When her behavior did not throw everyone into a turmoil, she could reach out for more positive satisfactions. Actually, it hasn't been quite as easy as it sounds—school has been rough, and there have been some community problems. However, there has been progress, steady and sure—and progress directly related to the particular cottage setting and the particular cottage parents.

Then there is Jacqueline, who moved into DePeyster from our older girls' cottage when it was first set up. She had been the despair of the older girls' cottage mother because of her boisterousness, fighting, and generally nonconforming, aggressive behavior. Before this, she had been the despair of our younger girls' cottage parents and, before that, in the first ten years of her life, of eleven sets of foster parents. Jackie, a Negro youngster of average intelligence, is an out-of-wedlock child whose father had never been in the picture, and whose mother deserted her before her first birthday. Her only known blood relative was her maternal grandmother, who showed just enough interest to keep her stirred up but not enough to be used constructively. Jackie, as a very little child, lost foster homes because of her aggressive, destructive behavior. As she grew older, she began to steal, to lie, to destroy other people's property as well as her own clothing and toys. The only place she did not misbehave was in school, where she did well academically and was a model of good behavior. When she came to us, she was an unusually tall, awkward, noisy, ungainly ten-year-old, justifiably rebellious and bitter about being pushed around, with no awareness of how her own behavior played a part in her many moves. She distrusted all adults, didn't get along with other children, was difficult and belligerent in the group. She had created so much confusion and made so much noise in the group that it was hard for cottage parents to keep aware of her own very real problems and needs. Even when they were understanding and sympathetic, they couldn't, in all fairness to the twenty-five others in the cottage, tolerate her behavior. Just when we thought we could see a little progress, she had to be rather abruptly moved to the older girls' group because of structural changes resulting from the fires. Things were at an impasse with her when DePeyster opened. Her behavior was impossible; the cottage parents, as well as the administration, were at their wits' end. She had, at camp, become friendly with the new cottage parents'

daughter, and at the same time she asked to move to DePeyster, the Faxes asked to have her. We agreed, not being very sure the decision was sound but not knowing what else to do.

Identification with Cottage Parents

Jackie moved into DePeyster in March, 1950, and remained there until July, 1951. During these months there was a dramatic change in her behavior that can only be attributed to the particular cottage situation. She had her own cubicle in the larger four-bed room. She took great pride in this and kept it in good order, in contrast to her earlier slovenliness. She identified closely with the Faxes, who in turn lost no opportunity to build her up in any way they could. In all the little inconsequential things which are inherent in day-to-day living, she gradually began to have some sense of participation and accomplishment. At this stage, probably the fact that the Faxes were Negro had meaning to Jackie. She could identify more completely with them, and made a very conscious effort to please them. As her aggressive and socially unacceptable behavior decreased, she could get more satisfaction in her placement. She continued to do well in school and rather quickly the whole picture of her adjustment changed positively. In July, 1951, at her own request, she moved into a summer mother's helper job. She did so well here that she remained on a foster home basis, at her own request. She keeps in touch with the Faxes, and their interest in her continues to have positive meaning for her.

There is Jud, now eleven, who has been in DePeyster since April, 1950. Jud had come to us from a foster home agency in September, 1947, having in a year's time worn out four foster homes. Jud is a white child whose mother had died when he was five, in childbirth. An aunt had taken the baby sister, but Jud's devoted father could not let him go to a distant city with the relatives. After a year of struggling, during which the child ran wild much of the time, the father requested placement. However, the separation from the child was as difficult for him as for the boy, and with all his anxiety he was a disturbing factor in the child's foster home adjustment. Jud himself had problems—he resented placement, he was hyperactive, had all kinds of food fads, temper tantrums, fantasied about his dead mother, and in general presented a picture of a disturbed, disorganized little boy. He was placed in a cottage group with a warm, accepting cottage mother and twenty other little boys. For a while things went reasonably well, on the surface. Psychotherapy was tried unsuccessfully.

(Continued on page 11)

A DAY CARE PROGRAM TO MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS*

Ethel Verry

Executive Secretary
Chicago Child Care Society
Chicago, Ill.

Out of her long and practical experience, Miss Verry discusses the different facilities necessary to meet day care needs.

THERE is a great deal of interest and concern now about the care of the children of working mothers. The general impression, verified by experts in the field, is that provision for day care of children is inadequate, and that mobilization and defense activities will certainly increase the need.

The present situation is not new and, though made more acute in some places by defense mobilization, is not due entirely to this cause. It is a continuation of the problems and dangers for children and families, particularly children of working mothers, brought to the fore during the years of World War II. There is, however, one important difference in the way we now view the whole matter. If we define an emergency need as one which appears suddenly, which will hopefully be of short duration, demanding immediate relief before thoughtful planning toward more distant goals, day care is not now an emergency need. Mobilization is an accepted part of our national economy, full employment a fact, and increasing incentives, both positive and negative, are pressing upon women, including the mothers of young children, to go to work. We can therefore safely assume that for the indefinite future substantial numbers of little children will be without the care of their own mothers during part of the day and large numbers of school children will be without the supervision of their mothers for hours preceding and following the conventional school day. The welfare of the total community will be in jeopardy if these children are not protected from the hazards to which they are sure to be subjected.

Long-Range Planning, Not Hasty Projects, Needed

The situation does not constitute an emergency but the needs of these children are pressing. Action to meet the need should be in the form of the thoughtful development of a variety of programs designed to promote the long-range welfare of these children and their families and the community, rather than hastily-devised shelters or hastily-organized day care agencies financed on a temporary

or "project" basis as a part of defense mobilization to meet ill-defined or unanalyzed needs. Such emergency agencies are potentially a danger rather than a protection to children, for poor standards are excused because of the need for quick action. They can be a temptation rather than a help to well-meaning, if ill-informed parents, insofar as they encourage mothers to seek employment to the detriment of long-range values for the family.

Three steps are basic to good provision for day care for children. The first is a clarification of the assumptions upon which the community wishes to offer the help and protection of day care for children. The second is a thoughtful analysis of the particular groups of children to be served and the specific needs of these children. And the third is the enlistment of support from industry, organized labor and the general public in the promotion of the programs agreed upon.

Should Mothers Work?

One of the major difficulties in the development of day care programs has been a conflict in what the community really believes to be a sound answer to the basic question: "Should mothers work?" On one hand, we believe in the right of women to take employment outside the home as well as work within the home. The community has tended to admire rather than to disapprove the professional woman who was able to combine motherhood and homemaking with a career. Industry, particularly in recent years, has been emphasizing the need for women workers and increasingly good jobs have been open to women on the same terms as men. Actually, not only are more and more women working in business, industry and the professions, but increasing numbers of these women combine motherhood with a full-time job outside the home. In April 1949, 4½ million mothers were employed in the United States, and of these, 1¾ million were mothers of children under six. Experts are unanimous in warning that a good part of the additional labor needed for expanding defense industry must come from women. In explanation, if

* Presented at the Illinois State Conference of Social Work, November, 1951.

not in justification of this situation, the report* of the 1951 conference on day care stated:

"Our cultural pattern has changed. For the following reasons more women are working:

- "1. They are now more acceptable to industry.
- "2. They have developed skills in industry as a result of the recent war.
- "3. They find emotional satisfaction in work.
- "4. They need to work because of rising prices, continued inadequate assistance grants, frequent loss of the breadwinner to the armed forces and to labor relocation, and because of social problems resulting from broken families."

On the other hand, doctors, social workers, psychiatrists, educators, now stress the importance of family care and mothering for children. The separation of young children from their mothers is not to be undertaken lightly nor can it be casually effected without danger to the child's development. Such a conviction undoubtedly underlay the recommendation given first place in the report of the 1951 day care conference:

"Specifically, the conference recommends that because of the importance to the nation of the welfare of their infants and young children, every opportunity should be sought and utilized to support and publicize the essential service to the nation being rendered by mothers who remain at home to care for their own children, as well as foster mothers who care for children of parents who cannot maintain a home for them."

To the general question, "Should mothers work?" we can then muster convincing arguments for either a negative or an affirmative answer. In a discussion in the *Social Service Review*,† Dr. Irene Josselyn and Ruth Goldman conclude: "The only generalization which can be made to the best interests of the public's welfare is that some mothers should work and some should not." When all is considered, this seems the only logical answer.

We believe that it is important for mothers to stay at home and that their most important job is to care for their children, but we do not disapprove of a mother's going to work if good care for her children can be provided and she prefers it that way. Day care programs should be planned to implement this freedom of choice. But they should assure protection and good care for the children involved, without putting a premium on mothers going to work, or tempting them to do so for economic gain alone. This calls for very thoughtful planning and administration.

* Report of the Conference on Planning for Day Care and Extended School Services in Areas Affected by Defense Mobilization, Children's Bureau and Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, February, 1951.

† "Should Mothers Work?", *Social Service Review*, March, 1949, pp. 74-87.

What Is Primary Emphasis of Program?

Considerable ambivalence is evident as to whether the community considers day care for children primarily an educational or primarily a welfare activity. There is, of course, general agreement that the two disciplines must both be involved in providing any particular program. All standards for day care programs emphasize the principles of good child care and training as well as the inter-relationship between these aspects and the child's family situation. Every day care program needs both the skills of child development specialists and the skills of caseworkers. There appear, however, to be definite differences between a program primarily educational, with welfare added, and one based primarily upon welfare considerations with education and child development an "also important" provision. For example, short hours of group care are clearly better for young children from the point of view of education and child development. But the well-being of the child of the working mother, not to mention the demands of industry, may require an 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. day, and even Saturday morning care. The general uncertainty as to primary emphasis is evident in our vagueness and inconsistency about the way in which individual programs are to be financed.

The report of the 1951 day care conference has a section on financing, recommending, "Financial support, adequate to the realization of the above objectives (i.e., a good community program of day care), as well as flexibility for its use, should be provided." The report implies this support should come from Federal as well as local funds. Federal funds for the purpose are to be administered through the Office of Education and the Children's Bureau, respectively, and channelled through state educational and welfare agencies. Further, state day care plans are in general to arrange for the financing of day care centers and foster family day care through "existing public welfare agencies", and extended school services, both nursery school and before and after school care, are to be planned through "the public school system". Nothing is recommended as to industries setting up or financing their own day care programs. Implicit in this is at least a partial answer to the question of how to organize for day care. Clearly children are to be the concern of their own parents and of the whole community, acting separately or together. We are properly suspicious of any plan to arrange children's care as a "side issue" to an industry, even an important defense project. Some children's services should be provided free to all who wish to use them, just as we now recognize public responsibility for providing good public schools. Other services are to be dis-

tributed, as are the other welfare services of the community, on the basis of determined need. Expense of such care can be shared with the parents using it.

Which day care services belong in each of these groups and why? It seems to me to clarify the situation to divide into four groups the children whose care is being considered. First, infants and very young children, shall we say, under 2½ or 3 years. Second, children from three through early school age. Third, school children whose days are now largely spent in school but whose after-school care and supervision is a matter of community concern. Fourth, children whose need is either night care or irregular care, because of night or swing shift assignments.

Child Under Three Needs Individual Care

The major consideration in planning day care for children under three is that these little ones do not thrive in group care. However convenient for the mother and her family and for the employer it might be to develop congregate nurseries where infants could be parked in clean and safe cribs from early morning until late at night while their mothers were busy tending switchboards, typing records or making steel bearings, it would be bad for the child. The child under three must have individual mothering. So, if his own mother leaves him for any large part of the day, he has to have a substitute mother, one to whom his happiness, care and entertainment are the first responsibility. It must be a very special situation in which society gains by substituting a foster mother for an own mother. Economically it is usually quite costly and socially inadvisable, at least from the standpoint of one member of the group—the baby—because such separation is hard on him.

Should we then disapprove of all day care placements for children under three and try to prevent them? I am convinced that there are a good many situations in socially and economically maladjusted families where day care helps. Among the several possible plans for helping a young widow or widower, an unmarried mother, a struggling couple about to be submerged by economic or emotional difficulties, day care for their infant or young child would seem on occasion to offer most in the way of protection for the child and constructive help for the family. If the community needs to supplement and subsidize a parent or family over a bad spot, there is no good reason why a day care plan should not be used if it promises most in the way of constructive and protective help—except the sad fact that few communities have this form of care available.

Homemaker service, sometimes mentioned in this connection, will be the answer, privately arranged,

for most working mothers in the higher economic brackets. It should also be available through community agencies for special emergency family situations. It is, however, hardly an answer which the community could subsidize on any large scale as meeting the day care needs for the children of working mothers, for it seems uneconomical to pay one woman to go into another woman's home to care for a baby so that the mother may choose to work elsewhere.

Foster family day care, on the other hand, has, in some places, become an accepted part of well-rounded community provision for day care. It does present difficulties but experience has proved that it is possible so to administer the plan that it promotes the welfare both of working mothers and of their young children. It has been estimated that there were about 90 foster family day care programs in operation in the United States during the last war. Most of these were set up and financed on an emergency basis. By 1945, a Child Welfare League survey showed there were only 13 such services still operating. I. Evelyn Smith, consultant on day care for the United States Children's Bureau, concluded after a survey in 1947 that there is an obvious need for foster family day care but that the service is best provided under the sponsorship of an authorized welfare agency which can make medical and social services available also. A large proportion of the mothers using the family day care service were women from broken homes with relatively low incomes and in need of casework services.

The experience of our own agency, both during and following the last war, in developing foster family day care, impels me to confirm the opinion expressed by Miss Smith and underline the importance of providing foster family day care as a part of every community's general child welfare program. It seems best to use it not primarily as a service to enable mothers in two-parent homes to go to work, but in situations where the alternative would be full-time placement or serious neglect of the child. In other words, where the maladjustments in the family group will be helped most by day care for the child.

Obviously, some mothers have always, on occasion, left their babies with a neighbor, in order to take a job, and some will undoubtedly continue to make such private arrangements. A good licensing law with a state welfare department adequately staffed to enforce the law would do much to protect children from the worst dangers inherent in such private planning, yet leave to those parents capable of taking the initiative in planning for their children, the freedom to do so.

(Continued on page 13)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Howard W. Hopkirk Takes New Appointment

THE appointment of Howard W. Hopkirk as Executive Director of the Louisville and Jefferson County Children's Home in Kentucky has been announced by the Board of that agency. Mr. Hopkirk has spent nearly 24 years with the Child Welfare League of America. He served with Dr. Carstens from 1924 to 1934. His second period of duty was in the capacity of Executive Director from 1940 to 1949. He resigned in order to insure a period of complete rest and relaxation after the strain of the war years and the heavy duties they brought. He then served the League as consultant until February of this year.

During the entire period that Howard Hopkirk was associated with the League it had his complete devotion and loyalty. He never forgot that the League is made up of member agencies but neither did he ever lose sight of the fact that it is more than the sum total of its members. During his tenure as Executive Director the membership increased steadily, the budget was more than doubled and the prestige of the League was increased and broadened beyond the borders of our own country.

The years of Mr. Hopkirk's tenure as Executive Director were among the most turbulent and crucial in the history of modern child welfare. It was the period that saw an unprecedented development in public child care services. It was the period of World War II, with its problems of divided families, working mothers, early marriages and high birth rate. It was the period during which the future of private child caring agencies was painted in somber colors by many observers when grave problems of public policy in child welfare arose. It was the period of personnel shortage, foster home scarcity, black markets in adoption, and investigations of institutions.

More than all this, it was a period of new understanding of the needs of children, of active legislative movements in their behalf, of new and better facilities, of greater volunteer participation, of better community planning, of larger child welfare budgets, of improved relations between public and private agencies, of stronger private agencies, of better coverage and better quality of care.

Howard Hopkirk was in the midst of all these things and part and parcel of the fast-moving daily scene. He was never lost, never discouraged, never willing to give in to pressures either internal or external, and never without the long clear vision of the leader.

He foresaw and warned us of the need for day care programs long before they became a commonplace throughout the nation in World War II. Two decades ago he saw the direction that institution care would take and a few years later wrote about it in his book, *Institutions Serving Children*.^{*} He worked out the soundest techniques in agency surveys yet devised, in the opinion of this observer, and then put them into practice. He saw the international aspects of child welfare before the organization of UNESCO; and above all he kept close to the heart and the needs of America's youngsters.

His contributions to the Child Welfare League have been great, and through the League his impact on the development of child welfare in one of our most exciting and exacting eras has been far-reaching and profound. No man in social work has a greater humility, a better grasp of the essentials of child welfare, a deeper sense of obligation, nor a keener and better disciplined sense of mission than Howard Hopkirk.

Thus far this editorial has dealt almost entirely with Mr. Hopkirk's professional attributes. It would be an unforgivable omission not to record here something of the man himself, his superb courage, his deep convictions, his regard and respect for his friends, his complete integrity, and his delightful and penetrating sense of humor.

Howard Hopkirk has built something of himself into the League and he leaves it better and stronger than when he came to it. Our warm congratulations and best wishes accompany him as he steps out to meet his new challenge in Kentucky. Godspeed, Howard, and let us keep the lines of communication open between Louisville and West 40th Street!

LEONARD W. MAYO
Vice-President

^{*} Published by the Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y., 1944.

A RESIDENCE UNIT FOR ADOLESCENT BOYS AND GIRLS

(Continued from page 6)

Jud presented a severe behavior problem in school, and in addition, despite average intelligence, simply did not learn. He bullied other children, had all kinds of paranoid ideas of persecution. He became increasingly disturbed and our psychiatrist recommended hospital care. However, he was rejected by the psychiatric hospital because his behavior was considered too unmodifiable for treatment. He was moved into DePeyster temporarily, until we could figure out what we could do for or with him. He was placed in a double room with a boy two years older, and with less aggressive behavior problems. As with Jackie, his aggressive behavior almost miraculously disappeared, and at this time in his cottage activities and in his day-to-day living, he presents a picture of a pretty adequate little boy. His disturbance still shows in his school adjustment—he is still unable to read, for instance—but even there the disturbingly aggressive behavior is at a minimum. What has happened to him? The basic disturbance is still there, but in this particular setup he has been able to settle down and gain some recognition without the pressures of the larger group. He is beginning to reach out for relationships with his peers, as well as with some adults. He is able to use remedial help now, and we think he is accessible to psychotherapy. There is still a long road ahead, but we are confident that eventually he can work through his deep-seated problems.

And who are the other DePeyster children? Joe, a dull, frail white boy of thirteen, a chronic bed-wetter, a runaway from previous placements; Laura, fifteen, a very inadequate, physically immature, dull white child who was hopelessly lost in the larger group; Bob, a white-skinned Negro boy of fourteen, caught in a maze of family problems, confused about his racial identification, withdrawn, aloof, bewildered, with some active homosexual behavior; John, another hyperactive, aggressive thirteen-year-old who was caught up in the midst of parental conflicts and who reacted with temper tantrums, stealing and generally defiant behavior; Jerry, a depressed, withdrawn, extremely fearful fourteen-year-old who had experienced a number of unsuccessful foster home placements; Carol, seventeen, disorganized, unattractive, unpopular, with no sense of self-esteem—a school failure in spite of good intelligence, a completely rejected girl with severe aggressive behavior problems—stealing and fire-setting among them—in her background, a child who through her own behavior had to make any kind of relationship fail to prove her worthlessness; Randy, actively schizophrenic, pre-

sented no management problem because of his extremely quiet, withdrawn behavior—a boy who lived much in fantasy.

Coeducational Group Proved Sound

In retrospect, I wonder that this particular assortment of youngsters did not tear the place apart. That they did not, and that each child made positive gains both in his awareness of himself and in his ability to live within the group structure, is a tribute to the cottage parents, but also indicates, we feel, that the general setup of a coeducational group at this age level is sound. Certainly our five high school seniors added a measure of stability to the group—and also gained considerable satisfaction from the more intimate and yet more independent living situation this group provided. These girls, ready as they were to assume a measure of adult responsibility, unconsciously did much to set the pattern and spirit of cooperation in the group.

We have been roundly criticized and told that we are courting disaster by operating a coeducational cottage for adolescents, particularly with an interracial group. We are repeatedly asked about our sex problems, and about all of the problems of boy-girl relationships. Our feeling is that there is much less prospect of sex problems when boys and girls have an opportunity to grow up casually together, working and playing together, than when they are segregated by color or sex. We have found no indication that this is not true, nor that there are any complications because the group is interracial. In this connection, I might add that while DePeyster is the only coeducational cottage at Leake and Watts, the whole program stresses coeducational activities and *without* all the dire consequences we are warned about. It is certain that with a sound coeducational program there is very little if any of the homosexual activity stimulated by and often prevalent in segregated groups. So far as DePeyster is concerned, we have been criticized not only for having youngsters of both sexes together, but for having them in small bedrooms with doors on them. The idea seems to be—and this from people who are considered child care experts—that if institution boys and girls grow up under the same roof, or if they are permitted any privacy, they will immediately and without exception get involved in sexual activity. That simply has not been our experience. In fact, we'd even go so far as to say that it's normal for boys and girls to grow up together—it happens in the best of families—even in relatively large families like ours.

Probably the most significant thing to come out of DePeyster's brief existence is this: *Regardless of color,*

age, or sex, each child has become increasingly aware of himself, not only as an individual but as a member of the group. Factors contributing to this have been, first of all, the cottage parents, with their accepting, non-punitive attitudes, their ability to see each child as an individual with problems and rights of his own, but also with responsibilities to those with whom he lives. The size of the group has been important, because it is small enough to afford ample opportunity for intimate personal relationships both among the children themselves and between the children and adults, and yet large enough that the youngsters are not threatened by too intimate relationships if they are not yet ready to take these on. There is a group structure flexible enough to allow a wide latitude in handling of individual and group situations, and yet firm enough to provide the needed controls. The physical structure, too, is important—children need space of their own and privacy, as well as plenty of space in which to spread out. Actually, DePeyster represents a combination of things—a group which has the sound and positive elements of family structure, and yet, with its wide variations in age, sex, color and general background, represents a community in microcosm. These youngsters, through their day-to-day living, are aware of people as people, living, working, playing together harmoniously, without regard for color, racial, cultural or social background. They are growing up with an appreciation of the fact that various racial groups, while different in some respects, are fundamentally the same, that what is called “democracy” for a majority group in the community is real *only* if the various minorities share equally in the privileges as well as in the responsibilities. What we have done and are doing here should not be termed an “experiment” in democracy, but rather an example of what can be done when people have sufficient faith in themselves and others to create—even though as unwittingly and “unplanfully” as we did here—situations where children and adults of various groups can live, work and play together to the mutual well-being of all.

Reprints About and By Foster Parents

Reprints of the article, “Evaluating Motives of Foster Parents” by Dr. Irene Josselyn, Institute for Psychoanalysis, Chicago, Ill., and discussion by Charlotte Towle, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, which appeared in the February issue of *CHILD WELFARE*, are available from the League office at \$.25 each. The discussions by two foster mothers, “Why We Are Foster Parents”, which appeared in “News from the Field” in the March issue, have also been reprinted and are available at a cost of \$.10 each.

Scripts and Recordings Now Available

Scripts and recordings of “The Turning Wheel”, the Child Welfare League’s four half-hour radio dramatizations broadcast recently and acclaimed as “top interpretation”, are now available. The recordings, starring Melvyn Douglas in stories about day care, foster home care, and treatment of disturbed children, and Jane Wyatt, in an adoption story, are suitable for board meetings, public gatherings, and local radio stations. Member and provisional agencies may borrow the recordings free of charge; other organizations may rent them at \$5.00 per program; recordings are for sale at \$15 per program. Scripts are available at \$.75 each, their cost to the League.

Recordings of “The Helping Hand”, four 15-minute panel programs presented recently, featuring various experts in child care, with Leonard W. Mayo, League Vice-President, as moderator, are also available. These records may be rented for \$3.50 each. All scripts and recordings may be ordered from the League’s Public Relations Department.

Another series of four programs of “The Helping Hand” will be presented by the League in cooperation with the National Broadcasting Company on April 12, 19, 26, and May 3, from 5:30-5:45 p.m. Please check local affiliate networks for dates and times these programs will be broadcast locally.

CORRECTIONS

In publishing “Early Placement in Adoption,” by Mary Elizabeth Fairweather, in the March, 1952, issue of *CHILD WELFARE*, we erroneously stated that portions of this article had appeared in *The Child*, November, 1951. Miss Fairweather’s article in *The Child* was condensed from a paper presented at the National Conference of Social Work, Cleveland, 1949.

The two discussions, “Why We Are Foster Parents,” which appeared in “News from the Field,” also in the March issue of *CHILD WELFARE*, were incorrectly identified. The *first* was by Mrs. H. M. S., Jewish Children’s Bureau of Cleveland; the *second*, by Mrs. D. A. H., Iowa Children’s Home Society, Des Moines.

We regret these errors.

New Mimeographed Case Record Available

A new mimeographed case record is available to agencies and schools of social work for teaching purposes, No. 209, “Help to a Troubled Adolescent in a Boarding Home Setting.” This may be ordered from the League for \$.35; a discount of 15 per cent will be allowed for orders of 10 or more.

A DAY CARE PROGRAM TO MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS

(Continued from page 9)

Licensing Should Be Insisted On

For children under three, then, the community should not try to make any general free provision for day care, but rather exert every possible effort to keep the child and his own mother together. However, since some parents will make independent placements, licensing independent boarding homes for day care should be strengthened and the need for such protection publicized so that mothers making independent arrangements learn to ask for and receive this assurance of the safety of their children. This can be insisted on just as we now insist on licensed doctors or dentists or certified public accountants who deal with assets of less importance than our children. A great deal can be done in this area by a licensing department adequately staffed. Newspapers will cooperate, for example, by requiring evidence of a license before running advertisements for private individuals to board children. Foster family day care would be provided and subsidized under the auspices of authorized child welfare agencies in volume sufficient to provide for those situations in which day care with casework can be the most satisfactory service in strengthening the family and insuring the children with adequate day to day care. Day care of infants and small children is a welfare function.

When we consider the second group of children, from approximately the age of three to school age, we have a rather different situation. While these children are still dependent upon their mothers and while their welfare precludes any abrupt separation from home, they have also other needs, not least among which may be properly supervised play with children their own age in a good environment and under good leadership. Children from three to six, crowded in tiny flats, supervised by over-burdened mothers, without easy access to play groups, deprived of constructive play materials, miss much in the way of developmental opportunity. It seems to me that a good case can be made for arguing that parents of all children over three should have an opportunity to choose for these children experience in a good group setting for at least a part of the day as an alternative to the child's remaining at home. Whether or not the mother uses the free time which this might give her to care for younger children, concentrate on her housework, rest, or take a job could be left to the choice of the individual mother. This type of day care is a proper responsibility of our schools.

However, many public schools do not as yet provide even kindergarten, so that many children actually have no access to group experiences prior to entering first grade. It has been in response to the needs of these children that we see the great development of private or commercial nurseries and nursery schools. Although of obvious importance to the welfare of children, commercial nurseries in Illinois were not even subject until quite recently to state inspection and licensing. This situation was corrected by the provision of the Child Welfare Act of 1949 that no person shall act as a child welfare agency or conduct a family home without a license, and further, the definition of "child welfare agency" to include day care centers. It was some time before the Welfare Department was able to put this legal safeguard into effect and only now are commercial nurseries actually being inspected and licensed by the Illinois Welfare Department.

After-School Care Presents Problem

The third group of children about whose day care we have justifiable concern are those of school age and older who are now left to their own devices before and after school when a mother's working hours do not coincide with or extend beyond the customary school day. Children left unsupervised are children in danger, particularly in urban communities. Belief in the importance of the mother to her home and family, and of family experiences to the child himself, has led the community to resist extending the hours of supervised care of children away from their own homes. Already the child's center of activity has tended to become the school rather than the family, and the extension of the school day to overlap with long working hours of a mother leaves very little time for family experiences. It is undoubtedly better for a child to leave school at the end of the conventional school day, to hurry home for a snack and a moment of conversation with Mother and then be free to see playmates in his own neighborhood if he wishes, to bring them home if that fits his mood or the weather, or just to stay at home, secure in the knowledge that his mother knows where he is, approves of his activities and is ready to lend a helping hand if he should need it.

Not only is this impossible for the working mother, but it is not actually a true picture of the after-school activities of many children in many an over-burdened, over-crowded home in a bad neighborhood, where the child's after-school hours are spent in unsupervised play, in dirty alleys, or on busy streets. Need for after-school and Saturday care for older children varies widely from neighborhood to neighborhood

and depends not only upon the number of working mothers in the neighborhood but also upon such factors as the adequacy of housing, play space and play leadership and the incidence of delinquency. Recreation groups at settlements and neighborhood clubs offer some help in this problem, but most of these lack what to me seems the essential element of any real "child care" program, namely provision for the formal registration of each child. Working parents cannot be satisfied with casual arrangements for children to drop in at the neighborhood house to play. An after-school care program requires that each child be accountable for attendance to an adult who accepts responsibility for him as an individual for stated periods of time.

Such day care centers for school children were a notable part of Vienna's child welfare plan so famous in the 1930's. Unfortunately they have never been developed to any great extent in this country. Back in 1947 the Child Welfare League published an excellent booklet describing the movement.* This report concludes, "Family life has been strengthened where the centers have been good, for not only can some children be kept at home rather than having to be sent to institutions or foster homes, but group care itself has been found to be helpful to many children." It seems clear that a day care center for school children is an unmet need of most of our communities. This is a field which calls for imaginative leadership if this type of community agency is to be added to our accepted pattern of services for children.

Night Care Not Advisable

The last group of children about whom recurrent concern is expressed are those whose mothers work on the night shift or, even worse, on swing shifts. Given a situation in which good day care suitable to the child's age and condition is available, a mother can work and still preserve her home and family life. But I am convinced that women who work night shifts or very irregular hours cannot accomplish this. For the community to struggle to aid them by makeshift programs of child care at night or at irregular and changing hours, seems futile and an encouragement to failure rather than a child welfare measure. With reference to such situations, the 1951 day care conference recommendation included in the report seems wise: "Whenever it is found that women with young children are gainfully employed . . . it is essential that such women be employed at such hours, on such shifts, as will cause the least disruption in their family life; organized labor and management should be

*"Day Care Centers for School Children—Planning and Administration," Child Welfare League of America, N. Y., 1947.

encouraged to work together for jobs for mothers with shifts which recognize their home responsibilities." The community's protection for these children should be to help their mothers make better plans, rather than to provide "foster care" during the night or at odd hours.

No simple measure of a given community's need for one or more day care services will readily be found. According to the report, it was the general consensus at the day care conference that

" . . . the need may be found, not by exact statistical evidence, but rather by the experience and judgment of representative persons and agencies. It would be difficult, for example, to show measurable need without having adequate services available. The survey method, which is often suggested, may show what plans are being made by mothers, and what facilities they would like to have, but it cannot give conclusive evidence of specific needs.

"The real need might best be determined through assistance from community planning councils, state welfare departments, coordinating councils, parent-teacher organizations, White House Conference committees, employment services, labor and industry at the local and state level; and by national agencies and organizations at the national level."

Just as no simple measure of day care needs can be found, so no one tidy answer to day care needs will be adequate. A good day care program for most communities will certainly include a center for after-school care of older children, group care in a good nursery school for the three- to six-year-olds, and foster family day care provided by an authorized child welfare agency. It will also protect the private arrangements made by parents for child care through a strong, well-administered law requiring the licensing of all private families taking children for day care and all nurseries and child care centers, whether under public welfare or commercial auspices.

Where defense mobilization creates an emergency, federal help may be available. But most of us, community by community, will have to take care of our own children. This care will not be the result of one spectacular effort by one group. It will result from the earnest efforts of several groups working in the areas I have indicated and cooperating to protect the most precious asset we are mobilizing to defend, our children.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Mills College of Education

THE former Mills School of New York has recently been granted the status of an independent college under the new name of "Mills College of Education." In the past degrees had been granted by Adelphi College, Garden City, L. I., N. Y. This new status makes Mills the only independent college in New York State specializing in training teachers specifically for nursery, kindergarten and primary work.

Information for the Unmarried Mother

"WHERE Can I Go For Advice?", a folder intended to answer some of the first questions of an unmarried girl who finds herself pregnant, is now being distributed by agencies in Vermont which offer services to the unmarried mother. The folders are being sent to doctors, lawyers, members of the clergy, school principals, overseers of the poor, and other groups of persons in a position to make the information known to girls who may need it.

The folder was developed as a result of a long period of study by the Inter-Agency Discussion Group of Burlington, which includes the Elizabeth Lund Home, the Vermont Children's Aid Society, the Vermont Department of Social Welfare, the Vermont Catholic Charities, and The Salvation Army. The group began its study with an examination of how adequately the needs of unmarried mothers were being met in Vermont by social agencies. When it was found that the services offered were not quite broad enough in certain areas, some of the agency executives took the problem to their boards, with resulting changes and clarifications of agency policies which have enabled the agencies to meet the need more adequately.

"Where Can I Go For Advice?" is a small, simply presented folder with the following introductory paragraph: "To bear a child out of wedlock presents the mother with many grave problems. You will find the answer to some questions in this folder. Please pass it on to any person you know who needs this information. Ask any of the listed agencies for additional copies."

The pamphlet is in the form of questions and answers as follows:

- Q. I think I am going to have a baby. I am not married. What shall I do?
- A. First, see your doctor and find out for sure.
- Q. I do not want people in my home town to know about it. Where can I go?
- A. There are several places where you can go for advice. Write or telephone: (names and addresses of the five agencies giving this service and their branches are listed).
- Q. Do my folks have to know about this?
- A. If you are over 21 it may not be necessary. If you are under 21, that is, not of age, someone at one of the places listed will be glad to discuss with you the question as to whether your family must know.
- Q. If I go to inquire, will anyone try to make me accept their plan, and keep pestering me if I don't?

A. No. You will be told about services offered but you will be free to decide whether you want to accept these services. If you say you do not want the help that is offered, no one will persist in giving it.

Q. May I keep my baby if I go to one of these places?

A. Yes, the decision is up to you.

Q. What can I do with the baby if I can't take it home?

A. You can probably make arrangements with one of the places listed to care for the baby, for a short time, until you can make some other plan.

Q. What if I want my baby placed for adoption?

A. If you think that is the best plan for your baby any of the agencies listed will help you.

Q. How much will this cost me?

A. Talk this over with the agency of your choice. Help can usually be given even if you do not have much money.

Q. Does the baby's father have to know?

A. Not if you don't want him to.

Q. Can any of these agencies make the baby's father pay my expenses?

A. This may be possible if you desire it.

Q. Does it make any difference if I don't live in Vermont?

A. Not necessarily. Talk this over with someone at the agency which you decide to contact.

CONFERENCES

The Southwest Regional Conference will be held April 27, 28, 29, 1952, in Austin, Texas. Headquarters will be the Hotel Driskill. Miss Rosalind Giles, Director, Division of Child Care, State Department of Public Welfare, Austin, is chairman.

The South Pacific Regional Conference will be held in Long Beach, California, May 1, 2, 3, 1952. Headquarters will be the Hotel Wilton. Mr. Clyde S. Pritchard, Executive Secretary, Children's Bureau of Los Angeles, is chairman.

The New England Regional Conference will be held June 9, 10, 1952, in Poland Springs, Maine. Miss Helen M. Wheeler, Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass., is chairman.

The Midwest Regional Conference will be held September 25, 26, 27, 1952, in Des Moines, Iowa. Headquarters will be the Hotel Savary.

The National Conference of Social Work will be held May 25-30, 1952, in Chicago. Headquarters for the Child Welfare League of America will be the Congress Hotel.

LEAGUE'S NATIONAL CONFERENCE PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

THE program of the Child Welfare League of America for the National Conference of Social Work, to be held May 25-30 in Chicago, has been announced by Mrs. Nora Phillips Johnson, Director, Foster Home Department, The Children's Aid Society, New York City, who is national chairman of the League's planning committee. Jacob Hechler, Director, Pleasantville Cottage School, N. Y., is chairman for the East Coast subcommittee; Martha Branscombe, Director, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, Chicago, chairman for the Midwest subcommittee; and Clyde Getz, Executive Director, Children's Home Society of California, Los Angeles, chairman for the West Coast subcommittee.

Opening the League's program will be a symposium on "Basic Concepts in Child Welfare", to be held May 27 at 2 p.m. Mrs. Irving Edison, President, Jewish Child Welfare Association of St. Louis, Mo., will preside; the speakers will be Dorothy Hutchinson, Professor of Social Work, the New York School of Social Work; Dorothy Waite, Chief, Casework Services, Division of Children and Youth, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, Madison, Wis.; Miss Lois Wildy, Executive Director, Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.; and Margaret E. Butcher, Supervisor of Homefinding, Chicago Child Care Society, whose paper is being prepared jointly with Eleanor Hosley, Executive Secretary, The Day Nursery Association of Cleveland, Ohio, and Mrs. Fern M. Pence, Executive Director, Children's Day Care Association, Fort Wayne, Ind.

A meeting on "Research in Child Welfare Programs" will be held on May 29 at 2 p.m., Mrs. Clifton Utley, Chicago, Member, Board of Directors, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, presiding. Capt. Henry S. Maas, Chief, Psychiatric Social Work Section, Letterman Army Hospital, San Francisco, Cal., on military leave from the University of Chicago, where he is Assistant Professor in Human Development, will speak on "The Place of Research in Child Welfare Programs". Clyde Pritchard, Executive Director, Children's Bureau of Los Angeles, Cal., will speak on "Use of Research Under Citizen Direction".

This year the League is sponsoring five concurrent group meetings on May 27 and five on May 29. The first group meeting on May 27 will discuss the emotionally disturbed child. Dr. Margaret W. Gerard, Chicago Analytic Institute, will be the speaker; Helen Hagan, Social Research Assistant, Child Welfare League of America; and Ruth H. Atchley, Direc-

tor of Casework, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y., discussants. Mrs. Helen Harris Perlman, Assistant Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, will preside.

The topic for the second group meeting is, "What Is Constructive for Children in the Institution Setting?" Eva Burmeister, Executive Secretary, Lakeside Children's Center, Milwaukee, Wis., will preside. Jacob Hechler, Director, Pleasantville Cottage School, N. Y., will be the speaker; Mary Lou Tannus, Beloit Lutheran Children's Home, Ames, Iowa; Mrs. Gisela Konopka, Associate Professor, University of Minnesota; and Dr. Irene M. Josselyn, Institute for Psychoanalysis, Chicago, Ill., discussants.

"Multiple Relationships of the Foster Child" will be discussed by the third group meeting, Mrs. Deborah M. Southerlin, Chief, Child Welfare Division, State Department of Public Welfare, Columbia, S. C., presiding. Louise Gilbert, Supervisor, The Children's Agency, Louisville, Ky., will be the speaker; Mrs. Rebecca Smith, Casework Supervisor, Children's Bureau, New Orleans, La.; and Dr. Ralph D. Rabinovitch, Neuropsychiatric Institute, University of Michigan, discussants.

The fourth group meeting will deal with, "New Directions in Homefinding", with Richardson L. Rice, Superintendent, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Mass., presiding. Mrs. Belle Wolkomir, Supervisor, Jewish Child Care Association of Essex Co., Newark, N. J., will be the speaker; Katharine E. Griffiths, Executive Secretary, The Diocesan Bureau of Social Service, Hartford, Conn.; Johanna Schenk, Psychiatric Social Worker, Riggs Clinic, Pittsfield, Mass.; and Mrs. Neville Weeks, Placement Consultant, Children's Home Society of Greensboro, N. C., discussants.

"Homemaker Service—A Preventive to Child Placement" will be the topic of the fifth group meeting, with Dora Goldfarb, Director, Community Homemaker Service, Jewish Family Service, New York City, presiding. Mrs. Eleanor Dornenburg, Chairman, National Committee on Homemaker Service, Conference of Catholic Charities, Pittsburgh, Pa., will be the speaker; Mrs. Tracy Clough, Supervisor, Minneapolis Family & Children's Agency; and Leon H. Richman, Executive Director, Bellefaire, Regional Child Care Service, Cleveland, Ohio, discussants.

The first group meeting on May 29 will deal with "Evaluation of Citizen Participation in Child Welfare", Manuel Siegel, Executive Director, Citizens Committee on Adoption of Children in California, presiding. Lowell Iberg, Associate Director, State Charities Aid Association, New York City, will be the speaker; Clyde Pritchard, Executive Director, Chil-

dren's Bureau of Los Angeles, Cal., discussant; and a second discussant to be announced.

The second group meeting will discuss, "Problems and Methods of Surveying Need and Evaluating Programs for Day Care", Mrs. Edwin Kuh, Member, Board of Directors, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, presiding. Dr. Donald O. Cowgill, Professor of Sociology, University of Wichita, Kans.; and Judith Cauman, Executive Secretary, Associated Day Care Services of Metropolitan Boston, Mass., will speak.

"Casework With the Child's Own Family in Children's Agencies", will be the topic of the third group meeting, presided over by Mrs. Elizabeth K. Radinsky, Director of Casework, Children's Service Bureau, Brooklyn, N. Y. Herbert Aptekar, Executive Director, Jewish Community Services of Queens-Nassau, N. Y., will be the speaker; Katherine J. Dunn, Case Consultant, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, Dayton, Ohio; and Mrs. Dorothy C. Washburn, Assistant Supervisor, Children's Aid and Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Buffalo, N. Y., discussants.

The fourth group meeting will discuss, "What Keeps Us From Giving Children What We Know They Need", Callman Rawley, Executive Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service, Minneapolis, Minn., presiding. David Crystal, Executive Secretary, Rochester Jewish Social Service Bureau, N. Y., will be the speaker; Frieda Kuhlmann, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Society of Newark, N. J., discussant; and a second discussant to be announced.

The fifth group meeting will deal with, "The Operating Agency as the Auspices for Social Work Research". Presiding officer and speakers are to be announced. Co-sponsoring groups for this meeting are the Social Work Research Group, the Family Service Association of America, and the American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers.

The annual meeting of the membership of the Child Welfare League of America will be held May 29 at 11:15 a.m., Marshall Field, President, presiding. The League's annual dinner meeting will be held May 29 at 7 p.m. As this issue goes to press, the speaker has not yet been announced. Mr. Field will preside.

New League Provisionals

Children's Foster Care Services
3325 East 14th Street
Oakland 1, California
Clayton E. Nordstrom, Executive Director

Medina Children's Service
3020 Arcade Building
Seattle 1, Washington
John Bryce, Executive Secretary

BOOK NOTES

THE ADOPTED FAMILY, Book I, You and Your Child: A Guide for Adoptive Parents; Book II, The Family That Grew: A Picture Story Book for the Child, by Florence Rondell and Ruth Michaels. Crown Publishers, New York. 1951. 64 pp. \$2.50.

This attractively designed publication consists of two books, one for adopted parents and one for adopted children. Workers in adoption settings and related fields will find in it a valuable summary of thinking which has been developed from sound adoption practice and observation. It is a good source of reference for both adopting parents and prospective adopting parents who seek answers to "What can I read?" or "What should I say when. . . ?"

While all parents could gain help from this book in understanding their own children and the role of a wise parent, adopting parents will feel added reassurance. Beginning with suggestions regarding preparation for adopted parenthood, the discussion proceeds to even such details as how to announce a new baby. What to tell relatives, friends and the community, for example, is considered realistically in terms of comfort, appropriateness, and the purpose to be served. The right to privacy in such matters is reaffirmed.

Subsequent chapters deal with how to prepare the child for his adopted status, from early childhood through adolescence. Such discussions should be helpful to parents who are anxious about initial handling of inquiries about natural parents and adoption, who find it hard to accept the recurrence of these questions with the growing child, or who dread the adolescent's inquiries. A practical evaluation of untruthful explanations and why they cannot be successful should also prove effective in helping parents to face the reality situation more comfortably.

The book maintains a wholesome perspective in pointing out that children's fundamental needs and the wise parent's role are the same, whether the family group was formed by natural parenthood or through adoption. The differences inherent in adopted parenthood, however, are recognized and dealt with.

Many questions which inevitably arise in the adoptive situation are discussed, and while answers are gratifyingly abundant, they are not glib replies to be memorized. They appear more in terms of sound psychological explanations underlying emotional needs. There are no long professional terms or abstruse concepts, but rather simple, uncomplicated observations which, once understood, will enable the adopting parents to act naturally and confidently.

"The Family That Grew," a small book for the adopted child to read and have read to him, is attractively illustrated and appealing. At first reading, it seems almost too general. Used as its companion book for parents suggests, it becomes a good starting point for amplification of the individual child's own story. Adopting parents will find many points subtly designed to provide opportunity for discussion in the areas more difficult to approach and about which adopted children may have unvoiced questions. The intent is to provide a natural and enjoyable approach wherein adopted parents can comfortably adapt the sound principles outlined in the first book to their own individual manner of expression and application.

These books represent one of the best recent approaches to problems inherent in adoptions, and should be useful reference books for the professional reader as well as recommended reading for adopting parents.

WINIFRED A. COBBLEDICK

Director, Northern District, Children's Home Society of California

WHAT DOES THE NURSERY SCHOOL TEACHER TEACH?, by Elizabeth Doak. National Association for Nursery Education, Chicago. 1951. 39 pp. Single copy, \$.50; 25 or more, \$.35.

Many times in her teaching career the nursery school teacher is asked by a lay person, "But what do you teach a three- or four- or five-year-old?" If the teacher is at all sensitive to her role in the life of children, she will have stopped occasionally to analyze the content of just what she is teaching.

The pamphlet prepared by Elizabeth Doak, *What Does the Nursery School Teacher Teach?* is one that could well be read by all nursery teachers at just such intervals of self-examination. While one might wish for more clarity in the organization of the material, it covers, with sensitivity and warmth, the major areas of the learning process of the pre-school child, and the role the teacher assumes in facilitating this process. If, as the study of the human personality indicates, much learning takes place before the child reaches first grade, it becomes the responsibility of the pre-school teacher, who exerts a great influence in directing the early growth of personality, to understand fully those areas of learning of which the pre-school child is capable and for which he is psychologically ready.

All of the specific teachings discussed in the pamphlet might be called concomitants of two major areas, "The teacher teaches the children the beginnings of good social living," and "The teacher in-

creases her children's interest in and understanding of their immediate world."

The quality of group leadership furnished by the teacher helps set the patterns in personal relationships as children learn to relate to their peers in the gradual process of becoming a group. It is at this stage that children learn to accept new situations, handle their frustrations, and share experiences, as well as materials, in their working and playing together, as they discover that experiences other than the family experience can be secure and happy ones where the child's role as an individual is accepted and valued. As the teacher helps with these experiences, she simultaneously helps the child to develop that sense of self-worthiness necessary for creative, confident living. One might wish that the pamphlet had explored a little more intensively the meaning of group living to the pre-school child.

As the child becomes socially acclimated to an increasingly large number of people, his awareness of his environment grows and many opportunities to develop his understanding of the world around him occur. Through broadening experiences and guided self-expression the work habits that are the foundation of a good school experience are taught. His nursery school teacher gives him a beginning sense of geography, a beginning concept of number values, and attitudes toward the language skills which demonstrate a readiness for reading.

Above all, as the pamphlet states, the very quality of the teaching in a good nursery school provides experiences that bring satisfactions to the inquiring mind of the child as he searches and evaluates and makes decisions many times, on a group basis as well as individually. This pamphlet, which clarifies and re-emphasizes these basic values in teaching the pre-school child, is valuable to the nursery educator.

GERTRUDE DEMKO

Nursery School Director, New York Guild for Jewish Blind

CLASSIFIED AD SERVICE

Classified ads listing a box number or otherwise not identifying the agency will be accepted, with the stipulation that agencies wishing to avail themselves of this service must enclose with the ad a statement to the effect that the person presently holding the job is aware of the fact that the ad is being placed.

Insertion of five lines of six words each is made at the minimum rate of \$2.50. For each additional line, or a fraction thereof, the charge is 50 cents. Closing date is the eighth of the month prior to the month of issue. A check should accompany the order.

CASEWORK SUPERVISOR for progressive children's institution in Chicago area. Salary dependent on qualifications. Excellent personnel practices. Psychiatric consultation. Write Director, Central Baptist Children's Home, Box 117, Lake Villa, Ill.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, private agency giving institution and foster home care for 60-70 children a month. Completion of one year graduate work in recognized school desired. Prefer person with experience in institution and foster home placement. Write giving age, experience, education, references, salary expected. Bethany Home, 220 11th Ave., Moline, Ill.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, day care agency with both nursery and foster family day care programs. Graduate training and experience required. Salary range \$4300-\$5600. Well-established Community Chest agency. CWLA member. National Retirement, Social Security. Write Children's Day Care Association, 515 W. Jefferson, Fort Wayne, Ind.

GRADUATE CASEWORKER, foster home experience desirable, range \$3200-\$4600, excellent supervision, psychiatric consultation; member CWLA. Write Milton Goldman, Jewish Family and Children's Bureau, 319 W. Monument St., Baltimore 1, Md.

CASEWORKERS for progressive statewide program of protective service to children, in our Boston office. Mature graduates with or without experience. Salary range, \$3000-\$4200. Good supervision, personnel practices, psychiatric consultation. Write Robert M. Mulford, Mass. S.P.C.C., 43 Mt. Vernon St., Boston 8, Mass.

DIRECTOR for Community Chest Day Nursery, experienced in nursery school work and with ability to supervise and instruct. Salary commensurate with experience and education. Write Edward Street Day Nursery, 10 Edward St., Worcester 5, Mass.